## Case 1:05-cv-00508-JFM Document 14 Filed 08/02/05 Page 1 of 2 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

CHAMBERS OF
J. FREDERICK MOTZ
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

101 WEST LOMBARD STREET BALTIMORE, MARYLAND 21201 (410) 962-0782 (410) 962-2698 FAX

August 2, 2005

Memo To Counsel Re: Elizabeth Robles v. Edward Leventhal Civil No. JFM-05-508

Dear Counsel:

I have reviewed the memoranda submitted in connection with plaintiff's motion to compel. The motion is granted in part and denied in part.

My rulings are as follows:

<u>Interrogatory No. 3</u>: Motion granted. I am unpersuaded that the use of the words "you contend" in the interrogatory is so intrusive as to request the work product of defense counsel.

<u>Interrogatory No. 6</u>: Motion granted to the extent that it seeks an identification of all documents responsive to the interrogatory as clarified in Mr. Sheridan's letter of June 2, 2005.

<u>Interrogatory No. 7</u>: Motion granted to the extent that it seeks an identification of all documents responsive to the interrogatory as clarified in Mr. Sheridan's letter of June 2, 2005.

<u>Interrogatory No. 9</u>: Motion denied because I am granting the motion as to Document Requst No. 11.

<u>Request No. 3</u>: Request denied. Exhibits need not be identified until the pretrial order is prepared.

<u>Request No. 6</u>: Request denied. As phrased, the request does unduly intrude into the work product of defense counsel.

Request No. 8: Request granted.

Request No. 9: Request granted.

Request No. 11: Request granted.

Case 1:05-cv-00508-JFM Document 14 Filed 08/02/05 Page 2 of 2

Request No. 14: Request granted to the extent that it seeks the business and financial records of The Dental Center. The motion is denied as to the personal financial records of Dr. Leventhal because plaintiff has not made an adequate showing as to how those records would assist in calculating the amount of any unjust enrichment to Dr. Leventhal.

Defendant shall answer the interrogatories and produce documents in accordance with this order on or before August 16, 2005.

Despite the informal nature of this letter, it should be flagged as an opinion and docketed as an order.

Very truly yours,

/s/

J. Frederick Motz United States District Judge